

## CIA BAITING

(Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. WELTNER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the House the following article from the Washington Daily News of September 8. The article is written by Richard Starnes and is entitled, "Clip the CIA's Wings."

In the last paragraph of his article, Mr. Starnes describes anti-CIA expression as "CIA baiting." He contends this type of expression is legitimate—indeed is called for—and offers his own article as a justified expression of criticism about our chief intelligence agency. I submit that warranted criticism is often advisably recorded; but, I further contend that Mr. Starnes' criticism is perhaps unwarranted. In fact, I believe him to be guilty of the very thing he scorns—CIA baiting.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I applauded the efforts of the CIA. My remarks were directed to the House Members and are in the RECORD. At that time, I saluted the role of the CIA in aiding our national defense, and the dedication and ability of its employees in doing the same. These feelings obviously need to be restated.

Mr. Speaker, the CIA is a welcome target for all critics. To real and potential critics, it represents a snake without venom; it is defenseless and subject to wide varieties of abuse. Might I say though, that it is defenseless only because it chooses to be defenseless. I am certain, were the CIA to list its record of accomplishment, we would all be overwhelmed at the successes this relatively young Agency has enjoyed. I am sure we would be even more overwhelmed were we to compare such a record of accomplishment with the number of well-known and publicized failures. I think we would find an Agency with a very definite and positive posture of excellence.

The past failures of the CIA are major only in the sense that they are sensationally publicized. For the most part, the CIA is an unknown, and to discover something about an unknown is sensational. Since the Agency does not make it a practice to advertise success, the pub-

lic must be content with hearing of failure. Ask any citizen what he knows of CIA activity and he will tell you something about the Bay of Pigs, the U-2, or the recent Singapore exposure. Can he tell you what unfriendly governments the CIA has penetrated? Can he tell you anything about the successful U-2 flights, and the tremendous possibility these flights had for providing us with valuable intelligence information?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot resist comparing the CIA to any American airline. Every day, our airlines serve the public with safe and comfortable flights. This has become so common as to become unrecognized. Upon occasion, however, a plane disaster occurs and the front page of every newspaper is alive with details of the tragedy. This is news. Who

wants to read about every normal, safe, and pleasant flight? The CIA finds itself in the same position. A blunder is magnified beyond proportion and the public is left with a bad taste.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard, and will continue to hear, demands for a joint congressional committee to oversee the responsibility of the CIA. Apparently it is not enough that four congressional committees are already privy to much CIA information. No, the demand is made for a "master committee," one to get into specific projects and to investigate unsuccessful and embarrassing ploys. I cannot believe these demands are well thought out. I cannot believe those calling for such a committee have truly deduced the repercussions such an arrangement could have. To have the CIA directly responsible to a congressional committee for specific projects is to destroy the veil of secrecy which necessarily surrounds such projects. To advise additional Members of Congress of the Agency's innermost workings is to jeopardize the possible success of any particular project. I do not say that Members of Congress would consciously, though innocently, reveal any information of a secure nature, but confidential information becomes less so every time someone else learns of it.

The charges leveled against the CIA are all too familiar. They are collectively assembled under the catchall, irresponsibility. CIA is allegedly irresponsible when it errs, when a failure becomes known, and every time the desired result is not perfectly successful—in which case we would never specifically hear of it. Well, I do not think the CIA is irresponsible. Businessmen have learned that the virtue of courage and taking a chance is essential to success. The profit motive is the inspiration here. With the CIA, the profit motive is the maintenance of our national security and the freedom of all liberty loving people. This, to me, is a much more meaningful and essential end. In this sense, I salute the CIA for its determination and courage, and especially for its refusal to succumb to answering the pointless charges of ill-informed critics.

The Daily News article follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Sept. 8, 1965]

CLIP THE CIA'S WINGS  
(By Richard Starnes)

The vast, bumbling bureaucracy of the Central Intelligence Agency has lately been revealed as the profligate disbursing agent of millions of unaccountable U.S. dollars.

There can be no surprise in this: CIA responds to no checkrein, and is blessed with the same sort of lavish appropriations that make it such a pleasure to run up a budget for the FBI. The important difference, of course, is that the FBI must account for the huge sums Congress presses upon it, right down to the final box of paper clips, but the CIA operates under no such fretful inhibition.

The spooks simply wait upon an informal gathering of top-ranking members of House and Senate Appropriation Committees, explain their anticipated needs, and get the money. No CIA appropriation as such ever goes through the Congress, since the total (which approaches \$1 billion) is said to be

secret. Instead the sum is subdivided into handy items and buried in the appropriations for other departments of Government. Ten thousand tomahawks for the Indian Bureau, at \$100 each? Don't bet it isn't spook money.

No other branch of Government enjoys the high-riding irresponsibility of CIA. The Atomic Energy Commission, which contains enough secrets to destroy earth, operates under a legislative watchdog committee that was established with the act that brought AEC into being. The Defense Department likewise lives under the scrutiny of House and Senate Armed Services Committees.

Thus it is not a sound argument to contend that a joint CIA committee would become a sieve of information that would peril secret projects. Even Allen Dulles, who departed as head of CIA soon after the catastrophe at the Bay of Pigs, conceded in his otherwise nonrevealing memoirs, "The Craft of Intelligence," that he knew of no betrayal of secret information by any Member of Congress.

Lately the Nation has witnessed the inevitable fruit of the weaknesses inherent in such a policy. Lee Kuan Yew, Prime Minister of Singapore, revealed the 6-year-old plot of a tawdry CIA comic opera in which the huge espionage apparatus was caught trying to penetrate the security department of Singapore. CIA promptly offered Prime Minister Lee (Western-educated, anti-communist, and a rare ray of sunshine in the morass of Asian politics) a \$3 million bribe to forget about it.

Mr. Lee proved incorruptible, which must have surprised the free-spending CIAers, and wrung a wensling letter of apology from Secretary of State Dean Rusk. Routine incompetence impelled State Department spokesmen to deny the episode when Mr. Lee revealed it, altho it was plain that the letter would eventually make maladroitness liars out of them.

The big point here is not so much that the State Department rushed to show its traditional stupidity, nor even that the CIA has managed to convert Prime Minister Lee from a potentially valuable friend to an implacable—and scornfully contemptuous—enemy. The point is that dangerous dime-novel nonsense such as our all-thumbs man in Singapore perpetrated is inevitable as long as the CIA is permitted to go its headlong, unrestrained way.

The theory that Congress already exercises sufficient control over our spy agency simply won't float. Which of the clubby little group of appropriations committee spookwatchers authorized the \$3 million bribe, or even knew about it? Was the two-headed author of the Singapore caper sacked, or is he comfortably tucked away in Stockholm clipping Red Star and planning new triumphs of clandestine diplomacy? This witness surely cannot answer those questions, and, more to the point, neither can the Congress.

The last time CIA found itself on the rack, Senator Thomas Dodd, Democrat of Connecticut, read a speech (which the CIA had written) lamenting what was described as "CIA baiting." Sad to say, there will be occasion for much more of this baiting, until CIA is brought under the rule of law appropriate to an agency of Government in a democracy.